Unread - FYI

Dear Paul, your Epstein notes of 12/14/78, pp. 12- 20 MW 4/25/78

This will be hasty because a college class is coming soon, because I lost a day from other work I want to catch up on and because I've caught the first cold in years and do not feel good.

As by now you know the Post has a continuing interest in the Epstein-Angleton-SIC matter. Jim sent you copies of the Lardner review and yesterday's Kaiser story because that would save a day in reaching you. I spoke to George and I've already sent him this set of your notes. Before I read them, in fact.

It would be helpful if we could have some system for me to know if you send copies to Howard, Jim and Lardner. Howard and Jim should have them, period. Lardner should as long as the Post has an interest, what ver that interest is or becomes and whether or not it coincides with any of our interests.

I've become quite forgetful of the present while retaining sharp recollections of the fairly distant past. So I may not recall any arrangement we may make. However, because your notes are so good and because I can't take time for making them and because of what I believe is involved in this affair I am anxious, on the one hand, for these three to have copies but also anxious not to have to stay up too late or for Jim to stay up too late to make unnecessary copies.

Maybe I can remember that unless you indicate on the copy you send me that you have sent copies to these three I'll assume you have not. I think it would be easy if you could remember to add initial where you place mine, I presume for when you get to mailing.

A general statement of my present interests: while as of the past now limited by my limitations and therefore focused on what we can use in court, in the coming proceeding in the suit for the executive session transcripts. This is, legally, a rather unusual situation about which we cannot be certain of any interpretation. I have therefore suggested to Jim that we assume the appeals court wants a thorough and complete record made and that we should undertake that, regardless of the cost. It may mean I'll have to put out what for me is large sums to take depositions. (In this connection Epstein's address and phone may save Jim much time.)

For the suit one of the more important aspects is what the CIA and FBI gave Epstein, under and outside of FOIA. Recall the second Briggam affidavit, which was sent you? I think there is no question but that he swore falsely, little chance it is not, regardless of how any judge may rule, actual perjury. It is the most material factor in the case now, underscored, I believe, by what the appeals court has done.

While there is more I would like to do and while I retain an interest for when I can return to writing on AO, for the moment concentration on the litigation. I suggest you not underestimate what the potential can be.

Sources, your 34, WSJ review-may I please have?

35, on the leaking and not Angleton doing it: Maybe but I have reason to believe otherwise. There was a defector who used the name "Mr. Martin" who took the initiative in getting in touch with me and on Nosenko only. Very anti - paranoidally, irrationally. Politically this guy is an Angleton. I wonder if "Mr. Martin" comes from "Stone's" middle initial, M. You might want to review in your own mind what the political situations with respect to political assassinations was at the time of the first leaks. I think it is an important consideration in any analysis. And if you made any notes on what Schorr said about Angleton that you found interesting I'd appreciate the references for when the book is remaindered or in paperback. I can't afford to buy it now and do not have time to read it now. Ditto for when you see 36, the coming Dulles book. Also Colby's, 37. (I found Lardner's quote excellent journalistic judgement and importa nt in an otherwise excellent and perceptive and balanced review.)

38. Hugh McDonald will be a continuing interest. If you can find another copy of this trashy novel I'd like to have it as a means of continuing the rather large job I've done on him (including pre-pub and for two prospective publishers) and his disinformation. When I met him he was offering an added package of three novels, in addition to Appointment.

19 is the Psychology Today piece. You might want to add to those justified

criticisms that for every interpretation Epstein attributes to Lesinson there is at least another at least as apparent and in most instances more reasonable. Thus the rewriting of his notes when LHO was returning is consistent with my 1965 writing, suggesting it was to be an intelligence report. (Reminds me, on Jaggers-Chiles-Stovall, if your notes go to non-subject experts like Lardner it would be good not to abbreviate into JCS. Which could also be taken for Joint Chiefs of Staff and other orgs. And if LHO was in any intelligence role at JCS for the KGB, which is close to impossible, Epstein complicates it too much with his conjectures. This also places Oswald in a role other than he had a JCS. The simplest thing is that as a trainee in the offset photog. part he could have placed defective film inside his shirt. Of it he printed, made a second print. The central point Epstein misses is how a man with Oswald's past got a job doing classified work at all.

I spotted the same contradiction in beginning dates for the Epstein-RD project and decided to take the "in 1976" as a starting point to see how that works out with his having had access to Nosenko in 3/76. October is more likely in some ways. For example, the original planned pub date was October 1977, or two years ahead, reasonable. You might want to consider why the book was delayed, missing the important Xmas trade, and was made smaller, witness the lower than advertised price. I think it means the book was more than cut, may have been done over. Here note what Epstein says about when he completed it in the KSAN show.

From my point of view you are right in noting the importance of the fact that the CIA got him into the graphology nonsense, with a CIA person as graphologist. I think this can be of value to Jim in the suit and depositions.

Your wonders at the top of page 13 about what Epstein left out and his concern for his reputation may be explained by what was taken out of the book or by other things, not the least that he is a blabbermouth who also blabs his way into non-responses. BUt I disagree on his having made any effort to distance himself from James the Jesus. I think the opposite: that Epstein is openly aligned with the A and his faction of wreckers. (Noe that the CIA is not wrecked, is alive and healthier, and that only the A-types even suggest its demise.

At the bottom of this page you refer to CIA 376-154. Temporarily I have scads of cartons in front of that file in the basement. Could you please send me a copy? If I think it may interest Lardner or Kaiser I'll send a copy to one of them. And in this connection, as I think I may have asked you, can you let me have what I could not find a little while ago, that defector's "report" early after the JFK assassination, what was in the records the CIA gave the Rock. Commission? That exactly coincides with the kind of "thinking" I'd expect from my "Mr. Martin." If this hunch pans out it would be good to have some available info about the "Stone." But in any event, it was sick stuff.

Your KSAN notes: I take it the numbers are from a counter with C60 cassettes, this beginning with 1 three times.

As you note later at 14,098, Epstein is a rather large liar about keeping RD out/ So why would he lie so blatantly?

I have a hunch that the arrangements for the book shifted after the project began. Early on I heard that Garrison was project director. This may have been bad information but suppose it was not? Consider this in with the suggestions of major changes in the book? Consider that in connection with Epstein's obvious shift of alliance from the CIA (i.e., new CIA) to Angleton.

It is exceptional that with all his ins Garrison was out on the final book. I do not doubt that he had some earlier connections with it.

At 195 you comment "Typical Epstein - start with assumptions." Subject to the frailties of memory I can't think of any one of the many Epstein assumptions in any of his writing that was not a wrong assumption. Like the second autopsy job in Inquest. There is not one in Legend that is not less reasonable than others that are apparent. Amendment: Typical Epstein: Start with wrong assumptions.(This in case you were not jesting.)

258: It is not possible to make the study of Oswald that I have made and believe there

ever was a time he would have permitted himself to be under "KGB control." I believe this is a central fact in any analysis. There was never a time when Oswald was pro-USSR. I believe there never was a time he was not anti. Like in Liebeler's ra,blings when deposing Delgado, quoted at length in Oswald in New Orleans. I suggest that if you intend to carry this analysis forward you reread that chapter, with care and alert to ellipsis.

In this connection, aside from the silly Epstein conjecture I find no possibility of either Lee or Marina having any usefulness to the KGB in the US.

p.15, 265ff. The CIA memo on Oswald might have some court uses. This passage reminds me of the assumption there was no KGB debriefing of LHO. This assumption is made in US not USSR terms. I'd be quite surprised if the KGB did not get enough, verbally, from Intourist, which I would assume is keyed into the KGB with everyone.

The initial false assumptions about the USSR's rocketry capabilities is that it did not have a rocket that could be fired as high as the U-2 with any accuracy. I see no reason to credit Epstein's assumptions that they had no radar capable of use with the rockets they did have, SAMs. It was not long thereafter that these SAMs were doing rather well in Cuba.

Translation Epsteinking(Angletonian) horseshit. And this soft stuff is his very foundation.

Was Scott for real here? Did he really believe his question or was he putting EJE on to lead him into something?

322 I know of no basis for the allegation that LHO shot at Walker. The bullet was of the wrong caliber, too, and the scientific tests did not show any similarity. But who do you know who began to shy away from LHO then, as EJE ~~eyes~~ says? Only the invisibles.

423 Was LHO's mention of his part in the Indonesian adventure in a letter to his brother in the WC records? The fact was, but the letter? Or was it an intercept? If so, we both have unmet FOIAs on this, as does Mark A. Ditto on FOIA at 466.

p. 16, before 070, incomplete ref to FOIA. (This reminds me, I'd like to hear the entire tape and since it was aired to have it available for Jim's use. Same for any other tape, like Williams' and Golz'.

097 is where EJE says "I wrote my book in '76." If so extraordinary that it did not come out until 1978, did not meet the better October 1977 market - was not in fact out before October 1977. The normal hardback spread is about six months. With a topical work this is shortened. Something here, as suggested earlier. Can it include addressing it to defense of the Nagletonian ruin of the CIA, which follows, and he says in time came after he wrote his book.

p. 18, end side 2, CIA shrink "Robert Mayler" possible FOIA sue as secret leaked to EJE. Or obtained under FOIA, which would also make it useful to JL.

085 appears to refer to the record that says LHO was not CIA debriefed. Appreciate copy. Can't get to mine.

115 Anything on intercepted lettersuseful in court.

207 Maybe Francis Gary Powers was "convinced" of an LHO role but he did not tell his ghost, Gentry, that because Gentry was quite uncertain when he phoned me about it. I think Gentry used to to hyoe the book, not because it was real.

261 of interest to JL for in court, the spoon-feeding of the Barron book. Throughout. Note esp. that EJE says he could spend 6 months with the CI staff.

368 the ref to "from the FOIA requests" stops dead. Is there more on the tape?

P. 20, 400 Interesting if Angleton is responsible for the Senate Intelligence interest now.